

Remarks

Claims 1-11 are currently pending in the Application and Claim 11 has been canceled herein without prejudice.

Summary of claim amendments

This response amends Claims 1-10 to clarify the language of the claims. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in Figures 2-5 and the related text in the specification and in paragraph [0049] of the specification as published.

This response cancels Claim 11 without prejudice.

35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection

Claims 1 and stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In view of the amendments above, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection

Claims 1 and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Hirano (U.S. 6,570,628). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Hirano and further in view of Son (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0164974). Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Hirano and further in view of Morimoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,359). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Hirano and further in view of Watanabe (U.S. Pat. No. 6,373,213). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Hirano and further in view of Ogawa (U.S. Pat. No. 6,628,245).


Claim 1

A. Applicant submits that Hirano do not disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, the following features recited by amended Claim 1 of the present application:

“wherein the first display screen **at least partially covers** a control switch and/or a second display screen when the first display screen is in the second position” (emphasis added)

Referring to Hirano's Figure 1, reproduced below, the Examiner asserts that the “first display screen” as recited in amended Claim 1 is disclosed by Hirano's screen 6a (p. 3, section 5 of the final Office Action). The Examiner also asserts that the “second display screen” as recited in amended Claim 1 is disclosed by Hirano's screen 3a (p. 3, section 5 of the final Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.


F I G . 1



Although Hirano's display unit 6 is located in front of the display unit 3 (c. 4, ll. 27-29 of Hirano) and Hiran's frame 6b partially covers frame 3b, there is no teaching that Hirano's screen 6a at least partially covers the actual display screen 3a. According to Hirano, screen 3a displays navigation system and television (c. 3, ll. 63-65 of Hirano). Why would Hirano design a device where screen 6a partially covers the displayed navigation

system and television? That just does not make any sense. It is Applicant's position that frame 6b is positioned right up to and under the screen 3a as supported by Hirano's Figure 4, reproduced below.


F I G . 4



Looking within circle "X," added for clarity to Hirano's Figure 4 above, one skilled in the art can easily see that frame 6b is positioned right up to and under the screen 3a without covering the screen 3a. Because Hirano's screen 6a does not at least partially cover screen 3a, Hirano does not teach, disclose or suggest "wherein the first display screen **at least partially covers** ... a second display screen when the first display screen is in the second position" (emphasis added) as recited in amended Claim 1.

Furthermore, there is no teaching in Hirano that screen 6a at least partially covers a "control switch" as recited in amended Claim 1. This is clearly supported by Hirano's Figures 14, reproduced below.

F I G. 1 4



As can be seen from Hirano's Figures 14, the only thing that is located behind screen 6a is a CD deck 10. There is no "control switch" as recited in amended Claim 1. Because Hirano's screen 6a does not cover any control switches, Hirano does not teach, disclose or suggest "wherein the first display screen **at least partially covers** a control switch ... when the first display screen is in the second position" (emphasis added) as recited in amended Claim 1.

Hence, Claim 1 is patentable and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 2-8, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are also patentable over the cited art.

B. Applicant submits that Hirano do not disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, the following features recited by amended Claim 1 of the present application:

"a control device configured to **offer functionality of the control switch and/or display information from the second display screen** on the first display screen when the first display screen is in the second position"
(emphasis added)

Referring to Hirano's Figure 1, reproduced above, the Examiner asserts that the "first display screen" as recited in amended Claim 1 is disclosed by Hirano's screen 6a (p. 3,

section 5 of the final Office Action). The Examiner also asserts that the “second display screen” as recited in amended Claim 1 is disclosed by Hirano’s screen 3a (p. 3, section 5 of the final Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.

According to Hirano, screen 3a displays navigation system and television (c. 3, ll. 63-65 of Hirano), while screen 6a displays setting status of a CD deck, setting information and the operating information of an air conditioner (c. 4, ll. 9-14 of Hirano). There is no teaching that Hirano’s screen 6a is able to display information from the screen 3a. Because Hirano’s screen 6a displays information that is different from the information displayed on screen 3a, Hirano does not teach, disclose or suggest “a control device configured to ... **display information from the second display screen** on the first display screen when the first display screen is in the second position” (emphasis added) as recited in amended Claim 1.

If the Examiner does not agree, the Examiner is requested to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2) by designating “as nearly as practicable” where Hirano discloses that screen 6a displays information from screen 3a. Otherwise, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, as discussed above, Hirano’s screen 6a does not cover any control switches. Because Hirano’s screen 6a does not cover any control switches, Hirano does not teach, disclose or suggest “a control device configured to **offer functionality of the control switch** ... on the first display screen when the first display screen is in the second position” (emphasis added) as recited in amended Claim 1.

Once again, if the Examiner does not agree, the Examiner is requested to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(2) by designating “as nearly as practicable” where Hirano’s screen 6a offers functionality of a control switch. Otherwise, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-8

Claims 2-8, at least based on their dependency on Claim 1, are also patentable over the cited art.

Claim 9

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Hirano does not teach, disclose or suggest “wherein the first display screen **at least partially covers** a control switch and/or a second display screen when the first display screen is in the second position; and **offering functionality of the control switch and/or displaying information** from the second display screen on the first display screen when the first display screen is in the second position” (emphasis added) as recited in amended Claim 9. Hence, Claim 9 is patentable and should be allowed by the Examiner.

Claim 10

Applicant submits that, at least for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Hirano does not teach, disclose or suggest “wherein the first display screen **at least partially covers** a control switch and/or a second display screen when the first display screen is in the second position; and **offering functionality of the control switch and/or displaying information** from the second display screen on the first display screen when the first display screen is in the second position.” (emphasis added) as recited in amended Claim 10. Hence, Claim 10 is patentable and should be allowed by the Examiner.

* * *

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this document is being transmitted
to the Patent and Trademark Office via electronic filing.

June 3, 2008

(Date of Transmission)

Lonnie Louie

(Name of Person Transmitting)

/Lonnie Louie/

(Signature)

/Alexander Krayner 60,854/
Alexander Krayner
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 60,854
LADAS & PARRY LLP
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90036
(323) 934-2300

Enclosure - A Request for Continued Examination (RCE)